



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,101	12/09/2003	Yoshinori Shizuno	OKI.630	2667
20987	7590	09/29/2004		EXAMINER
				WARREN, MATTHEW E
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/730,101	SHIZUNO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew E Warren	2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                            |                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                       | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/9/03</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|                                                                                                                                            | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Specification***

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohsumi et al. (US 6,303,470 B1).

In re claims 1, 5, and 9, Ohsumi et al. shows (figs. 2E and 13F) a semiconductor device comprising a substrate (202) which has a main surface formed with a circuit element (201); a wiring (12 in figs. 2C-2E) which is formed over the main surface and is electrically connected to the circuit element; a sealing resin (206) which covers the main surface of the substrate and the wiring; and an external terminal (14 in fig. 2E or 204 in fig. 13f) which is electrically connected to the wiring and which is exposed from a surface of the sealing resin, wherein an edge of the sealing resin is formed inside an edge of the substrate (see 206 left in fig. 13F).

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Satoh et al. (US 2002/0025655 A1).

In re claims 1, 5, and 9, Satoh et al. shows (fig. 1) a semiconductor device comprising a substrate (1) which has a main surface formed with a circuit element (not shown); a wiring (4) which is formed over the main surface and is electrically connected to the circuit element (at pad 2); a sealing resin (5) which covers the main surface of the substrate and the wiring; and an external terminal (6) which is electrically connected to the wiring and which is exposed from a surface of the sealing resin, wherein an edge of the sealing resin is formed inside an edge 1(1) of the substrate.

In re claims 4, 8, and 12, Satoh discloses [0061] that the substrate is a silicon substrate.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh et al. (US 2002/0025655 A1) as applied to claims 1, 5, and 9 above, and further in view of cited case law.

In re claims 2, 6, and 10, Satoh does not specifically disclose the limitations of the claims, however, such limitations are “Product by Process” claim limitations. A “product by process” claim limitation is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, **In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17**(footnote 3). See also **In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685**; **In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523**; **In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324**; **In re Avery, 186 USPQ 116** **In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 254** does not deal with this issue); and **In re Marosi et al, 218 USPQ 289** final product per se which must be determined in a “product by, all of” claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. Note that Applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear.

“Even though product-by- process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based upon the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process.” **In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)**(citations omitted).

In re claims 3, 7, and 11, Satoh dose not specifically show the seal layer positioned inside of the side surface within the desired range however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to position the seal layer inside the side surface within the desired range, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable

ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the seal layer of Satoh by forming the seal layer inside of the side surface of a substrate in under 100 microns to form a package fulfilling a specific size requirement because Aller teaches that such a modification only involves routine skill in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ting (US 5,742,094) and Fukasawa et al. (US 6,657,282 B2) also show semiconductor devices having a sealing resin formed inside of a side surface of the substrate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E Warren whose telephone number is (571) 272-1737. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and alternating Fri 9:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2815

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MEW

*MEW*

September 27, 2004

*Tom Thomas*  
TOM THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800